DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 619 CS 508 794

AUTHOR Brown, Barbara
TITLE Three Groups' Perception of Broadcasting in the Public Interest: A Factor Analytical Approach to Definition.
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Audience Analysis; *Broadcast Industry; Communication Research; Factor Analysis; *Federal Regulation; Higher Education; *Mass Media; Older Adults; *Public Opinion; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Federal Communications Commission; *Public Interest

ABSTRACT

Since the Federal Communications Commission is to be a regulation service in the public interest, several studies investigated what several Midwestern American groups would consider "in public interest." The study began in 1991 with an examination of college students' attitudes. A second part of the study (in 1992) administered questionnaires to adults (age 53 to 92) in retirement communities and senior activity centers; and to 125 church members in a college town of 20,000. Researchers for the study used factor analysis because it focuses attention on commonalities among a broad spectrum of participants. Some of the results of the three studies are as follows: (1) all but the senior citizens think that society should be careful about sex and violence in programs; (2) the question of censorship did not appear in the pooled groups' factors; (3) crossownership and the consequent diminishing of the number of voices in the community is a concern to all these groups, not surprisingly since the town these groups live in was not one the FCC grandfathered; (4) the participants do not like broadcast campaigns and particularly commercials; (5) all groups recognize the importance of broadcasting and cable as both entertainment and issue/public service media; (6) all groups think the media should cover local events. (Contains five appendixes of data, the questionnaire, and 21 references.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 619

CS

Three Groups' Perception of Broadcasting in the Public Interest: A Factor Analytical Approach to Definition

Barbara Brown
Broadcast Division, Communication Arts & Sciences
314 Sallee Hall
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455

Phone: 309-298-1154

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS508784

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract:

Adults age 53-92 in retirement communities and senior activity centers, students in university public speaking courses and church members in a college town of 20,000 completed an instrument containing statements about current and historical aspects of the public interest in broadcasting. Data were explored using factor analysis techniques. Dimensions derived from each separate group varied widely among the groups. Factor analysis of pooled data from the groups provided solid "midwestern" dimensions.

Three Groups' Perception of Broadcasting in the Public Interest: A Factor Analytical Approach to Definition

A short history: FCC interpretations of the public interest

In 1927, Congress passed the Radio Act, designed to bring order to the chaos of a new medium. The Federal Radio Commission was established as a temporary agency to straighten out immediate interference problems. Current licensees were required to give up any claims to ownership of the airwaves, licenses were subject to renewal and to a new standard of service in "the public interest, convenience or necessity" (PL 69:632, §9), but the generally commercial nature of broadcasting was also affirmed. Licensees paid the "rent" of service in return for the privilege of having a usable medium in which to carry on their business and for having some of the competition cleared away from the path to earning money. Thus was born the "public trustee" concept of broadcasting in the United States.

The requirement of service in the public interest was a holdover from public utility law. The Federal Radio Commission, when pressed for definition the phrase, laid down "a few principles which have demonstrated themselves in the course of the experience of the commission and which are applicable to the broadcasting band" (2 FRC Ann. Rep. 166 (1928). These were that there be:

(1) "a substantial band of frequencies ... for the exclusive use of broadcasting stations and the radio listening public" (2 FRC 166, p. 168),

(2) "such action on the part of the commission as will bring about the best possible reception conditions throughout the United States" (2 FRC 166 p. 168),

(3) "a fair distribution of different types of service" (2 FRC 166 p. 168),

(4) "avoid[ance of] too much duplication" (2 FRC 166 p. 168),

(5) "in view of the paucity of channels, ... [no sharing of] the limited facilities for broadcasting ... with stations which give the sort of service which is readily available to the public in another form" (2 FRC 166 p. 169). For example, the commission went on to state, in a large city where phonograph records were available for purchase, the public interest would not be served by licensing a radio station which devoted a large portion of its day to playing phonograph records.

(6) "broadcasting stations ... not for the primary benefit of advertisers" (2 FRC 166 p. 169).

The commission also felt that the character and financial responsibility of the licensee should be taken into consideration, that a station should operate on a regular, published schedule, and that the broadcaster should do his or her best to control the frequency of the transmitter so as to provide good reception. Above all the commission felt that the "'public interest, convenience or necessity' was a comparative and not an absolute standard when applied to broadcasting stations" (2 FRC 166 p. 169).

Over the years, the Federal Radio Commission and later the Federal Communications Commission, the courts and sometimes Congress have considered many specifics of the public interest. For example, defamation of character over the air is not in the public interest except when candidates call each other names during campaigns, at which time it is not in the public interest to quash the name calling (Trinity

Methodist Church 62 F 2d. 850); WMCA, Inc., 40 FCC 241; Red Lion 395 U.S. 367, (1969); and others). Also not in the public interest are misleading a naive and sometimes gullible audience, whether by advertising questionable medical practices or patent medicines over the air, as Dr. John F. Brinkley did, (KFKB Broadcasting Association, 47 F. 2d. 670). Nor is convincing the public that the Martians have landed by devising a script which too closely resembled a real news script, as Orson Welles did in "War of the Worlds" (FCC mimeos 30294, 30295 & 30432 (1938)), or a taking money under the table for playing and plugging particular records on the air, as some disc jockeys have done, (Public notice, 23 FCC 2d 588, June 11, 1970).

The commission has also decided that it is in the public interest for licensees to refrain from editorializing (Mayflower Broadcasting 8 FCC 333, January 16, 1941), and conversely, that it is in the public interest for licensees to editorialize (In the matter of editorializing by broadcast licensees, 13 FCC 1246, June 1, 1949). The commission at one point decided that stations should treat controversial issues and treat them fairly (In the matter of editorializing by broadcast licensees, 13 FCC 1246, June 1, 1949), and, more recently, that there is no longer a need for a specific requirement that stations air programs about controversial issues in the community (Report of the commission concerning alternatives of the general fairness doctrine obligation of broadcast licensees, 2 FCC Rcd 5272, August 4, 1987). They recommended that certain kinds of programs ought to be broadcast (The Blue Book, March 7, 1946; The 1960 Programming Statement, 44 FCC 2303, July 29, 1960), and since 1981 that, at least for radio, no specific requirements should be made regarding programming type (WNCN Listeners Guild, 450 US 582, (1981).

Thus, while the FCC has always expressed support of the public interest standard, over the years the definition of the standard has

been flexible, with marked changes in implementation under recent deregulation. The whole philosophy of broadcast regulation has reversed itself. Instead of the "public trustee" concept which charges the "rent" of public interest programming, broadcast regulation since the late Carter administration, augmented under Reagan, has keyed itself to the "marketplace" concept -- competition is good, in the programming, technological and business spheres.

In actuality, of course, the pendulum never swings too widely. The basic tenets of variety of voices, quality of technology, viability of broadcasting as an advertising-supported business, and the twin programming thrusts of entertainment and information underlie whatever philosophy is in vogue or power at a given time. In addition, broadcasting in the United States sits on a framework of licenses issued to local markets, which requires maintaining the good will of local people, in itself a force for conservative practices.

Dimensions of the public interest

Continuing debate notwithstanding, sets of categories have been defined over the years as within the purview of the public interest. For example, one set of categories used to organize general broadcasting discussions is 1) variety of program service, 2) variety of public service voices, 3) aesthetic quality of program service, 4) technical quality of service, 5) fiscal viability of service, and 6) appropriate dispersal/delegation of financial and program control (cf., Head & Sterling, 1990; Burke, 1984).

Within each of the above categories, there is room for numerous interpretations of the public interest, witness the ebb and flow of regulation throughout broadcasting's history. Of particular interest to the author is the non-policy maker's definition.

Perception of the Public Interest

How do neophytes -- students for the purposes of Brown and Murray (1991) older, mostly retired persons in Brown (1992), and church members and the public in general in the case of the current study -- define "broadcasting in the public interest"? What qualitative aspects of programming seem to concern them most? Do the underlying dimensions of citizen concern parallel those of politicians or scholars or the FCC? And how does a policy maker discover citizen concerns?

Survey methodologies tend to treat respondents as a monolithic and homogeneous audience and do not consider the variations, needs and desires of individual audience members, a view which does not reflect the realities of audience use of broadcasting. Factor analysis, on the other hand, focuses attention on commonalities among audience members. In this way, audience analysis can be based on patterns of reaction, not on general demographic characteristics such as age or sex.

Brown and Murray (1991) used factor analysis to determine the public interest concerns of undergraduate students enrolled in the basic university public speaking course. Students were from all colleges in the university and were at all levels, from incoming freshmen to graduating seniors. Public interest dimensions derived using this group were Information Overload, Program Decency, Convenience, Anti-Crossownership, Commercial Overload, Public Issues, Anti-Centralized Power/Influence, Factual Information, Couch Potato, and Cost-Free Broadcasting. A review if the items in the analysis and their loading on each factor is included in Appendix B.

Brown (1992) used as subjects people, age 53-92, participating in senior citizen activities or residing in retirement villages or apartments and found the following dimensions: Detachment (from R/TV), Responsibility (of R/TV), Antimonopoly of Voice, Convenience (of information source), Conservative Social Values, Liberal Social Values, Ccuch Potato, Entertainment, Liberal Education, and Health News.

For the current study, Brown added 125 church members and combined the information from the three studies, deriving 10 factors for the church members and 9 factors for the pooled group.

Methodology

One hundred twenty-five members of various [mostly] Christian churches in a college town of 20,000 completed a questionnaire containing statements about the public interest in broadcasting/cablecasting. Church members were chosen as a way of supplying a middle demographic to add to the older and younger subjects in the first two studies. Ages actually ranged from 18-92, with over half of the group still in the 18-25 range, over one-quarter 75 years old or older, and about a fifth spread evenly between the two.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) is based on concepts of broadcasting in the public interest as reflected from the historical perspective of the public interest, from a review of categories of Broadcasting magazine's "Where Things Stand" section for the year from February 1988 through January 1990, in chapters of Doris A. Graber's Mass media and American politics (1989), and in sections of Sydney W. Head and Christopher S.Sterling's Broadcasting in America (1990).

From these sources, the Brown and Murray (1991) developed a 28-item questionnaire with a Likert-type answer scale. Data were analyzed using factor analysis techniques and the SPSS statistical package. Factors were extracted using principle components analysis and clarified using varimax rotation. Factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were selected.

Considerations

It should be noted that both the current sample of church members, the sample of older citizens and the student sample comprise people who are actively involved in life. Even the residents of retirement villages or apartments completed questionnaires as members of an active

community. In none of the studies are subjects isolated or inactive. Samples were smaller than optimum for factor analysis in the current (125) and senior citizen (73) studies, and the results of tests of viability of using factor analysis for the samples declined somewhat over the three samples. When the data for all three studies (569 cases) were pooled, however, indicators concerning the viability of factor analysis improved notably.

Results

Ten factors explained 62.7 percent of the variance in the student sample, 10 factors explained 74.4 percent of the variance in the sample of older adults, 10 factors explained 68.7 percent of the variance in the churchgoing group, and 9 factors explained 60.6 percent of the variance in the pooled group. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .68 for the students, .66 for the senior citizens and .55 for the church members, indicating usable, but not terribly comfortable, sampling adequacy, but in the pooled group, the KMO was .78, indicating adequate sampling. The percent of anti-image correlations greater than .09 for students was 84%, for older folks, 82.5%, for church members, 75.9%, and 89.2% for the pool, indicating some, but not a great deal, of correlation between variables. The Bartlett's test of sphericity had a significance of zero in all four instances, indicating that the correlation matrices were not identities. These measures signify that factor analysis is a reasonable method of exploring the data.

A comparison of the factors for the four groupings, their names, the variables upon which they loaded at a >0.40 level, and the amount of variance explained by each factor are included in Appendices B through E. The survey, containing the complete statement for each variable is contained in Appendix A.

Naming The New Factors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Pooled Information Group

Factor 1 - The generalized group favors commercially supported broadcasting, no commercials on cable and no campaigning on radio and television. Consequently, their first factor was named Value for the Dollar.

Factor 2 - The general group feels that radio and tv should allow public service times for community groups, allow responsible groups to express opinions on the air, limit sex and violence, but remember sports and movies are most important. The factor was named Decent Service and Entertainment.

Factor 3 - Use of the VCR for timeshifting, good coverage of local events, immediate coverage of important events and providing citizens with information about their government epitomize Convenience of Service, the third factor.

Factor 4 - Anticrossownership is the title given to the fourth dimension, composed of the two crossownership statements.

Factor 5 - The importance of broadcasting/cable for entertainment, particularly for movies and sports, plus an obligation to guide audience thinking about important issues make this dimension somewhat like the first factor for the student population, but without the student feeling of being overwhelmed by choices. The student factor was titled Information Overload. For the general population the factor seems to describe current broadcast television programming -- Mostly Entertainment, Some Public Affairs.

Factor 6 - With power and the bottom line as the focus, this factor is named Anti-Broadcasting as Business.

Factor 7 - The Liberal Crusader is what seems to tie together the concepts of more programming about women and minorities and being against commercials.

Factor 8 - The Couch Potato is a factor in each of the studies, comprising the same two variables in each - staying up late to watch television and wanting to watch more if it weren't all reruns.

Factor 9 - Broadcasting/cable as an Information Source is the focus of the last dimension, which includes wanting both health information and more educational programming.

Variables 18, 19, 22 and 23, the questions about too many programs and media, about program censorship and about local broadcaster attention to audiences, didn't appear in the factors.

Factors for Church Members

Factor 1 - Church members seem to distrust broadcasters and centralized media ownership, but like sports and movies and feel that there should be more information on women and minorities. Therefore their first factor was named "We Don't Quite Trust You, But...."

Factor 2 - Statements about the importance of programming other than entertainment, the need for good coverage of local issues and for educational programming comprise this factor, named Information Obligations.

Factor 3 - Conservative Social Values are exhibited in the desire to limit sex and violence on television, the acceptance of program censorship, the desire for public service time for church and community groups, and the feeling that there does not need to be more information on the air about women and minorities.

Factor 4 - The churchgoers Information Overload factor is similar to that of the students, but they are more concerned about commercial and campaign commercial clutter, and want to keep broadcasting/cable as a health information source.

Factor 5 - The Liberal Crusader wants more information about women and minorities, but doesn't like commercials on either broadcast or cable media.

Factor 6 - Here is the fourth iteration of the Couch Potato, with the same characteristics as with the other studies.

Factor 7 - Anti-Broadcast Entertainment Business relates to the same variables as the Anti-Broadcasting as Business factor with the general public but includes a statement against movies and sports.

Factor 8 - This factor, named Favor Advertising-Supported Public Service Broadcasting, includes acceptance of commercial support, giving community groups public service time and providing audiences with information about their government.

Factor 9 - On the other hand, there are those who think broadcasters should take stands and allow air time for spokespersons who support issues, but this group does not like commercial advertising as a way to pay for it. The factor describing this view is named Support Noncommercial Issue Coverage.

Factor 10 - Timeshifting is the only name for a factor which includes not caring about immediate coverage of important events and using the VCR to watch programs at the viewer's convenience.

Discussion

A fairly solid, no-nonsense set of expectations and biases comes out of the pooled data. The study was done in small-town Midwest, so the dimensions appear to the author to be standard midwestern values, somewhat conservative and middle class, but perhaps they represent so-called "middle America" in general. After the notable confusion the students had in making up their minds about what to watch or listen to, plus their somewhat unexpected support for program decency (Brown & Murray, 1991), and the fairly apparent detachment from electronic media of the older generation (Brown, 1992), a group that expects to pay for what they get and get what they pay for was refreshing, as was their well-rounded definition of programming.

The church groups tended to be a little less trusting of the electronic media than the other groups were, although they liked the entertainment programs and expected nonentertainment programming as part of a broadcaster/cablecaster's obligation.

What does all of this mean for the policy maker, the programmer and the owner?

Using the top three or four factors in each of the studies:

1) All but the senior citizens think that we have to be careful about the amount of sex and violence in programs, particularly those we allow our children to see.

2) Although all three of the smaller groups agreed that they wouldn't mind if a broadcaster censored a program, the question of censorship didn't appear in the pooled group factors, very likely because the association seemed to be split between censoring advertising and censoring sex and violence.

3) Crossownership and the consequent diminishing of the number of voices in the community is still a concern of these groups. The town from which most of the subjects were drawn was one of the sixteen that the FCC didn't grandfather when it developed the crossownership rules, and it still seems media-poor with five radio stations (three owners), a public television station, a 35-channel cable system, a daily newspaper and a thrice weekly college paper.

4) No one likes broadcast campaigns, particularly commercials. If we want to continue to use the electronic media to disseminate candidate information, we've got to find a way that turns off fewer people.

5) All groups recognize among their top factors the importance of broadcasting/cable as both entertainment and issue/public service media.

6) All groups think the media should cover <u>local</u> events. Most count on them for <u>immediate</u> information about important happenings.

The primary dimensions these groups reveal may not be novel, but they're very Midwestern, and their documentation needs to be noted.

The general expression of concern about program decency supports efforts in Washington that are often derided. Does it step on First Amendment toes to require less sex and violence in programming? The midwesterners seem to opt for a different balance between acceptable programming and free expression.

The question of what to do about campaigns should concern every politician and every policy maker. Should there be the same policy of local broadcaster decision making about campaign ads and programs as there is about ordinary broadcast programming? Citizens in this study support the concept.

Do we worry about retaining local broadcast outlets with the plethora of satellite services now or soon to be available? The subjects in this study consider localism important.

Should we be concerned about there being one owner of a large number of media outlets in a community in an era that allows radio duopolies and encourages telephone companies to buy cable systems? It's certainly one of the questions members of these groups would keep open for discussion.

People in the community are willing to pay for the media they use. What they ask in return is simply good, careful service. Does it seem more like the trustee model than the marketplace of ideas? It probably is.

APPENDIX A

Statements about Broadcasting

A questionnaire developed by Barbara Brown and Michael Murray

DIRECTIONS:

Below are statements designed to find out how individuals like you feel about certain aspects of broadcasting. Please answer all questions and answer as honestly as you can.

Circle the response which you feel best expresses your feelings. In each case a "7" indicates complete agreement and a "1" indicates complete disagreement.

1. Radio and television news should give us the information we need to be able to make good decisions about government officials and what they are doing.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

2. There should be laws to keep violence and sex off television when kids are awake.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

3. Radio and television stations should make sure that church groups, schools and other community service organizations get time for programs and announcements on the stations.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

4. Radio and television stations ought to have to set aside time for responsible groups to give their opinions about current problems.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

5. Radio and television stations should takes sides and support one side or the other in programs about current problems.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

6. Radio and television really aren't important to people except for entertainment.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. Radio and television stations and networks are really interested only in how much money they can make.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Television and radio have too much power in our lives because we tend to believe what we see and hear on them.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. We make too much fuss in this country about sex and violence on television.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. Radio and television should be used more for educational programming than they are now.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. For the average person, information programs on radio and television are the most important source of information about how to stay healthy.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. Candidates for public office really shouldn't be allowed to use television and radio to do their campaigning.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. The same person should not own the largest radio station, the largest television station, the largest daily newspaper and the cable system in a large city.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. In a small town, it is not right for the best radio station, the only television station, the only daily newspaper and the cable system to be owned by the same person.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

15. Movies and sports are the most important things on tv.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

16. There has got to be a better way to finance television and radio than using commercials.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

17. Cable television shouldn't have any commercials, since we pay for it every month anyway.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

18. With cable and broadcast television and VCR's and compact discs and radio and so forth, we are getting too many different kinds of media for people to be able to use. Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

19. Even with cable, I think we've got too many different kinds of programs to choose from. Who watches that stuff, anyway?

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

20. Advertising is the only way to go to pay for broadcasting. I think it's important that we have a way to learn about the world that doesn't cost us money all the time.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

21. We need more news about women, blacks and other minorities.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

22. I don't think local broadcasters ever pay any attention to what we audience members say we want to see or hear.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

23. If a broadcaster censored a program in our area, it would be all right with me.

Strongly Agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Disagree

24. Broadcasters must provide good coverage of local issues -- otherwise, all they do is relay network programs.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25. I'm glad I have access to a VCR because now I can watch my favorite show when I want to.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

26. I stay up very late some nights to watch tv even though I'll be tired the next day.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. I'd watch more tv except that the programs are reruns that I've already seen.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

28. Radio and television ought to bring us important events and happenings immediately or as soon as possible.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX B

Factors Explaining Student Perceptions of Broadcasting in the Public Interest

Item Number	Factor Loading	Item
Factor 1 - Information Overload		
Q19	.68415	Too many kinds of programs
Q18	.62084	Too many kinds of media
Q15	.59195	Movies, sports most imp.
Q5	.55352	R/TV should takes sides on issues
Q6	.46878	R/TV important only to entertain
% of variance explained 12.8		
Factor 2 - Program Decency		
Q9	-.75139	Too much fuss about sex and violence
Q2	.69324	Keep tv violence and sex away from kids Q23 .66095 Program censorship OK
% of variance explained 10.7		
Factor 3 - Convenience		
Q25	.73876	VCR good for timeshifting
Q24	.65877	Favor good coverage of local issues
Q28	.63307	Immediate coverage of important events
% of variance explained 7.5		
Factor 4 - Anti-Crossownership		
Q13	.89712	No crossownership - large city
Q14	.88463	No crossownership - small town
% of variance explained 5.9		
Factor 5 - Commercial Overload		
Q16	.77637	Against R/TV commercials
Q17	.61926	Against cable commercials
Q22	.52549	Broadcasters ignore audiences
Q12	.49396	No campaigning on R/TV
% of variance explained 4.8		
Factor 6 - Public Issues		
Q4	.77547	Responsible groups give opinions on R/TV
Q3	.58065	R/TV give public service time
Q1	.51563	R/TV keep citizens informed about gov't.
% of variance explained 4.5		
Factor 7 - Anti-Centralized Power/Influence		
Q7	.84200	R/TV only interested in money
Q8	.67553	R/TV have too much power
% of variance explained 4.3		
Factor 8 - Factual Information		
Q10	.72753	More educational programming
Q11	.56887	R/TV source of health info
Q12	.40406	No campaigning on R/TV
% of variance explained 4.3		
Factor 9 - Couch Potato		
Q26	.82923	Stay up late watching TV
Q27	.42516	Would watch more TV
% of variance explained 3.9		

Factor 10 - Cost-Free Broadcasting

Q20	.80759	Advertising supported R/TV
Q6	-.42745	R/TV important only to entertain

% of variance explained

Item number 21, "We need more news about women, blacks and other minorities," did not load highly enough on any factor to be included in the summary. Item number 12, "Candidates for public office really shouldn't be allowed to use television and radio to do their campaigning," loaded on two factors, Commercial Overload and Public Information. Item number 6, "Radio and television really aren't important to people except for entertainment," also loaded on two factors, positively on Information Overload/Entertainment

APPENDIX C

Factors Explaining Senior Citizen Perceptions of Broadcasting in the Public Interest

Item	Factor Loading	Item
Factor 1 - Detachment		
Q23	.69625	Program censorship OK
Q20	.61289	Advertising supported R/TV
Q22	.58246	Broadcasters ignore audiences
% variance explained 24.4		
Factor 2 - Responsibility		
Q7	.81033	R/TV only interested in money
Q8	.72742	R/TV have too much power
Q22	.58246	Broadcasters ignore audiences
Q1	.48191	R/TV keep citizens informed about gov't.
Q17	.41642	Against cable commercials
% of variance explained 9.0		
Factor 3 - Antimonopoly of Voice		
Q13	.90420	No crossownership - large city
Q14	.88463	No crossownership - small town
Q12	.60151	No campaigning on R/TV
% of variance explained 7.6		
Factor 4 - Convenience		
Q24	.77547	Favor good coverage of local issues
Q25	.72859	VCR good for timeshifting
Q28	.52782	Immediate coverage of important events
Q10	.72753	More educational programming
% of variance explained 7.0		
Factor 5 - Conservative Social Values		
Q2	.77323	Keep tv violence and sex away from kids
Q3	.61959	R/TV give public service time
Q5	.50054	R/TV should takes sides on issues
Q21	-.40536	More about women, minorities
% of variance explained 5.7		
Factor 6 - Liberal Social Values		
Q16	.79139	Against R/TV commercials
Q4	.63300	Responsible groups give opinions on R/TV
Q21	.52283	More about women, minorities
% of variance explained 4.6		
Factor 7 - Couch Potato		
Q26	.80682	Stay up late watching TV
Q27	.68989	Would watch more TV
Q3	.45441	R/TV give public service time
% of variance explained 4.4		
Factor 8 - Entertainment		
Q6	.75788	R/TV important only to entertain
Q15	.64160	Movies, sports most imp.
Q12	.42425	No campaigning on R/TV
% of variance explained 4.2		

Factor 9 - Liberal Education
Q9 .83669 Too much fuss about sex and violence
Q10 .54095 More educational programming
% of variance explained 3.9

Factor 10 - Health News
Q11 .51025 R/TV source of health info
% of variance explained 3.6

Items number 18 and 19, "With cable and broadcast television and VCR's and compact discs and radio and so forth, we are getting too many different kinds of media for people to be able to use," and "Even with cable, I think we've got too many different kinds of programs to choose from. Who watches that stuff, anyway?" did not load highly enough on any factor to be included in the summary. Other items loaded on several factors: Item 3, "Radio and television stations should make sure that church groups, schools and other community service organizations get time for programs and announcements on the stations" on Factors 5 and 7, Item 10, "Radio and television should be used more for educational programming than they are now" on Factors 4 and 9, Item 21, "We need more news about women, blacks and other minorities," on Factors 5 and 6, and Item 22, "I don't think local broadcasters ever pay any attention to what we audience members say we want to see or hear," on factors 1 and 2.

APPENDIX D

Factors Explaining Church Member Perceptions of Broadcasting in the Public Interest

Item	Factor Loading	Item
Factor 1 - We Don't Quite Trust You, But...		
Q14	.82634	No crossownership - small town
Q13	.82399	No crossownership - large city
Q22	.51458	Broadcasters ignore audiences
Q21	.48706	More about women, minorities
Q15	.64160	Movies, sports most imp.
% of variance explained	12.4	
Factor 2 - Information Obligations		
Q6	-.81565	R/TV important only to entertain
Q24	.77547	Favor good coverage of local issues
Q10	.54095	More educational programming
% of variance explained	12.0	
Factor 3 - Conservative Social Values		
Q23	.78786	Program censorship OK
Q2	.73556	Keep tv violence and sex away from kids
Q21	-.45986	More about women, minorities
Q3	.41670	R/TV give public service time
Q9	-.41032	Too much fuss about sex and violence
% of variance explained	8.1	
Factor 4 - Information Overload		
Q18	.76812	Too many kinds of media
Q19	.72778	Too many kinds of programs
Q11	.49419	R/TV source of health info
Q12	.46821	No campaigning on R/TV
Q16	.43400	Against R/TV commercials
% of variance explained	6.9	
Factor 5 - Liberal Crusader		
Q16	.73387	Against R/TV commercials
Q17	.62277	Against cable commercials
Q21	.40876	More about women, minorities
% of variance explained	6.7	
Factor 6 - Couch Potato		
Q26	.83199	Stay up late watching TV
Q27	.77676	Would watch more TV
% of variance explained	5.4	
Factor 7 - Anti-Broadcasting as Entertainment Business		
Q8	.76372	R/TV have too much power
Q7	.55732	R/TV only interested in money
Q15	-.45722	Movies, sports most imp.
% of variance explained	4.8	

Factor 8 - Favor Advertising Support of Public Service Broadcasting

Q20	.82168	Advertising supported R/TV
Q1	.59797	R/TV keep citizens informed about gov't.
Q3	.46736	R/TV give public service time

% of variance explained 4.6

Factor 9 - Support Noncommercial Issue Coverage

Q5	.80825	R/TV should takes sides on issues
Q4	.49220	Responsible groups give opinions on R/TV
Q20	-.43811	Advertising supported R/TV

% of variance explained 4.2

Factor 10 - Timeshifting

Q28	-.76639	Immediate coverage of important events
Q25	.61074	VCR good for timeshifting

APPENDIX E

Factors Explaining General Public Perceptions of Broadcasting in the Public Interest

Item	Factor Loading	Item
Factor 1 - Value for the Dollar		
Q17	.51476	Against cable commercials
Q12	.46599	No campaigning on R/TV
Q20	.41941	Advertising supported R/TV
% of variance explained 18.4		
Factor 2 - Decent Service and Entertainment		
Q3	.64530	R/TV give public service time
Q9	-.63257	Too much fuss about sex and violence
Q2	.62928	Keep tv violence and sex away from kids
Q4	.55017	Responsible groups give opinions on R/TV
Q15	-.41669	Movies, sports most imp.
% of variance explained 8.8		
Factor 3 - Convenience of Service		
Q25	.68998	VCR good for timeshifting
Q24	.62146	Favor good coverage of local issues
Q28	.62075	Immediate coverage of important events
Q1	.46903	R/TV keep citizens informed about gov't.
% of variance explained 6.4		
Factor 4 - Anti-crossownership		
Q13	.89629	No crossownership - large city
Q14	.87278	No crossownership - small town
% of variance explained 5.8		
Factor 5 - Mostly Entertainment, Some Public Affairs		
Q6	.74529	R/TV important only to entertain
Q5	.61792	R/TV should takes sides on issues
Q15	.47859	Movies, sports most imp.
% of variance explained 5.2		
Factor 6 - Anti-Broadcasting as Business		
Q7	.82702	R/TV only interested in money
Q8	.74931	R/TV have too much power
% of variance explained 4.5		
Factor 7 - Liberal Crusader		
Q21	.77596	More about women, minorities
Q16	.50240	Against R/TV commercials
% of variance explained 4.0		
Factor 8 - Couch Potato		
Q26	.83532	Stay up late watching TV
Q27	.55013	Would watch more TV
% of variance explained 3.9		
Factor 9 - Information Source		
Q11	.77054	R/TV source of health info
Q10	.40094	More educational programming
% of variance explained 3.6		

REFERENCES

Brown, Barbara J. and Murray, Michael. (1991, April.) The public perception of broadcasting in the public interest: A factor analytical approach to definition. Paper delivered at the Central States Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Brown, Barbara J. (1992) Older adults' perception of broadcasting in the public interest: A factor analytical approach to definition. Unpublished.

Burke, Richard C. (1984). . Comparative broadcasting systems. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Cable communications policy act of 1984 (47 USC 601).

"FCC fines Chicago station $6,000 for indecency." Broadcasting, 117, No 24. December 11, 1989.

FCC plans marketplace study. Broadcasting, August 27, 1990, p. 53.

Federal Communications Commission v. WNCN Listeners Guild, 450 US 582 (1981).

FTC comes out for fin-syn repeal. Broadcasting, September 10, 1990, p. 30

Graber, Doris A. (1989). Mass media and American politics, 3rd Ed. Washington DC: CQ Press.

Head, Sydney W. and Sterling, Christopher H. (1990). Broadcasting in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

In the matter of the application of Great Lakes Broadcasting Company, 3 FRC 32 (1929)
In the matter of editorializing by broadcast licensees, 13 FCC 1246

Kahn, Frank J. (Ed.). (1984). Documents of American broadcasting. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Memorandum Opinion and Order in Syracuse Peace Council, 2 FCC Rcd. 5043 (1987)

Memorandum opinion and order, 60 FCC 2d 858 (1976) (Policy statement), reconsideration denied, 66 FCC 2d 78 (1977).

The Radio Act of 1927, Public Law 632, 69th Congress.

The ready regulator. Broadcasting, August 13, 1990, p. 27.

Report of the commission concerning alternatives of the general fairness doctrine obligation of broadcast licensees, 2 FCC Rcd 5272, August 4, 1987.

Statement made by the commission on August 23, 1928, relative to the public interest, convenience or necessity, 2 FRC Annual Report 166 (1928)

Stephenson, William. (1989). Quantum theory of subjectivity. Integrative Psychiatry, 6, 180-185.

Syracuse Peace Council v. Federal Communications Commission, 867 F2d 655 (D.C. Circuit (1989) cert. denied week 1/8/90

Where things stand. Broadcasting, 116, No. 10. March 6, 1989, p. 10